

## REMARKS

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled. New claims 8 and 9 have been added. Claims 8 and 9 reflect clarifying language and amendments to canceled claims 1 and 5, respectively.

In the Office Action dated May 3, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,630 B1). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

First of all, Applicants respectfully submit that, with respect to new independent claims 8 and 9, the Owens reference does not teach or suggest the storage of subscriber-related information which includes, amongst other things, "actual availability-information of the forwarded-to subscriber associated with the plurality of terminals." Indeed, based on the inventive availability-information of the forwarded-to subscriber, at least one corresponding terminal device is selected, a message to be transmitted to the at least one terminal device is converted into a corresponding message format and, thereafter, the message is actually transmitted to such terminal device. Conversely, the Owens reference is silent as to the current availability of a forwarded-to subscriber whereby a message may be converted into a particular message format compatible with the terminal where the subscriber is actually available. At most, the Owens reference discloses a system whereby a message receiver may indicate a preferred communication medium for obtaining (retrieving) his or her messages. Owens does not, in fact teach or suggest the switching of a subscriber between any number of terminal devices associated with such subscriber.

In addition, the Owens reference does not teach or suggest "transmitting the converted message to the at least one terminal selected via a telecommunication network respectively corresponding to the at least one message format selected." The Owens reference, on the other hand, merely discloses a universal mailbox via which subscribers may exchange messages having different message formats. In all embodiments disclosed, the system of Owens still requires that the subscriber *proactively retrieve* his or her messages, even if such messages have been converted into a more desirable message format. Owens does not teach or suggest, nor

even contemplate, the *actual delivery* of a converted message to at least one of the subscriber's terminal devices based upon the subscriber's availability thereat.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 8 and 9 of the present application, as well as claims 2-4 and 6-7 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that also such claims be deemed allowable at this time and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is further noted that no additional fees are due in connection with this response at this time. If any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the office is hereby authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-351) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: August 3, 2004